JOURNAL OF
BUSINESS CHEMISTRY

Vol.22, Iss.1, February 2025
URN: urn:nbn:de:hbz:6-60119498897
DOI: 10.17879/60119498365

Research Paper

Abhijeet Chaturvedi*, Janvee Garg, Prof. Anil Kumar Singh*****

Frugal Innovation in Oncology: Tracing the Arc of Microchip Technology in Early Cancer Detection and Treatment

This paper explores the transformative role of microchip technology in oncology, focusing on its potential through the lens of frugal innovation. Specifically, it examines how 'Lab on a Chip' (LOC) technologies - miniaturized systems that consolidate multiple laboratory functions onto a single chip can significantly enhance early cancer detection and treatment, particularly in low-resource settings. By streamlining diagnostic processes, LOC devices offer faster, more affordable, and efficient cancer detection, which is critical for timely intervention. The study addresses two central research questions: how effectively can LOC microchips detect cancer cells in early stages, and how can they be integrated into cost-effective treatment strategies?

Through an exploratory literature review, the paper evaluates the technical specifications, diagnostic accuracy, and cost-efficiency of LOC technologies. It also investigates the role of nano-enabled biosensors in enhancing the sensitivity of cancer detection within these systems. Such advancements not only increase the chances of early diagnosis but also improve ongoing cancer monitoring, which is crucial for optimizing treatment outcomes. Beyond individual patient care, the broader implications of LOC technology are considered, particularly its capacity to reduce financial and infrastructural barriers associated with traditional diagnostics.

Keywords: *Frugal innovation, Cancer care, Early detection, Microchip technology*

Introduction

In recent years, the number of cancer survivors has grown exponentially and is expected to continue (Weir et al., 2021). By 2035, 24 million new cancer cases are expected worldwide, up from 18.1 million in 2018, highlighting a pervasive and pressing global health issue (Mollica et al., 2020). The variability in tumor growth rates among individuals highlights the urgency for early detection, which is critical in improving outcomes and survival rates (Crosby et al., 2022). Timely identification of cancer can significantly boost the effectiveness of treatments, reducing mortality rates and improving quality of life (Nass et al., 2019). In this context, microchip technology, particularly the 'lab on a chip' (LOC) innovation, emerges as a significant advancement, offering hope in improving diagnostic capabilities (Nagrath et al., 2007). This technological leap is not limited to diagnosing formidable diseases like cancer; it extends to enhancing

---

* Member CRIFT (Center for Research and Innovation in Frugal Technology), FORE School of Management, New Delhi, India, 064061@fsm.ac.in

** FPM Research Scholar - Strategy, FORE School of Management, New Delhi, India, janveegarg38@gmail.com, fpm21005@fsm.ac.in

*** Professor - Strategy, Professor in charge - CRIFT (Center for Research and Innovation in Frugal Technology), FORE School of Management, New Delhi, India, anil.singh@fsm.ac.in

Vol.22, Iss.1, February 2025
URN: urn:nbn:de:hbz:6-60119498897
DOI: 10.17879/60119498365

diagnostic processes globally, which is particularly vital in developing nations where limitations in resources compound the challenges of cancer care (Francies et al., 2020). The need for such innovations is emphasized by the increasing incidence of cancer and the economic strain it places on healthcare systems, making cost-effective solutions imperative (Patel et al., 2020). LOC technologies have the potential to streamline diagnostics, reduce costs, and make cancer care more accessible, particularly in low-resource settings (Mishra, 2023). These devices integrate multiple lab functions onto a single chip, offering a faster, cheaper, and more efficient means of cancer detection, which is crucial for early intervention (Bargahi et al., 2022).

This paper aims to take a critical look at microchip technology, focusing on how it can be used to detect cancer cells early and how it could be used to make treatment more affordable. The primary points of discussion are two research questions: how well microchips work for finding cancer cells early on and how modern technology for finding cancer cells connects with low-cost treatments made possible by microchips. The research questions are addressed through an exploratory analysis of literature, drawing from diverse sources available on Google Scholar across microchip technology, oncology, and frugal innovation. The methodology involves examining studies that assess the effectiveness of microchip technologies in early cancer detection, focusing on their diagnostic accuracy, sensitivity, and potential for improving early intervention. Additionally, the paper explores the role of these technologies in reducing treatment costs by enhancing diagnostic efficiency and accessibility. The analysis includes an evaluation of the technical specifications of microchips, such as their integration of multiple lab functions onto a single chip, and their impact on diagnostic outcomes. The exploration includes an analysis of technical specifications, diagnostic outcomes, and cost-efficiency contributing to frugal innovation (Grover, Garg and Singh, 2024), to provide a comprehensive overview of how these technologies can impact cancer care. This exploration not only reflects on current capabilities but also identifies potential areas for future development and application in global health systems (Winton et al., 2016).

Early Detection of Cancer: The Crucial First Step

Early cancer detection is crucial for improving prognosis and significantly enhancing survival rates for individuals affected by cancer (Shaver, Croom-Perez and Copik, 2021). Traditionally, diagnostics have relied on methods such as mammography, colonoscopy, and Pap smears, which, despite their effectiveness, are resource-intensive, demanding substantial financial investment, sophisticated equipment, and specialized personnel (Schootman et al., 2015). This creates barriers to access, especially in low- and middle-income countries where the need for affordable and accessible cancer diagnosis is most pressing (Brand et al., 2019).

Frugal innovation becomes essential in this context, focusing on delivering substantial value while drastically reducing the resources required. Microchip technology, particularly LOC systems, embodies this approach by providing a robust yet cost-effective solution to the challenges of early cancer detection (Özyurt et al., 2023). These microchips integrate with nanotechnology, enhancing diagnostic capabilities; nano-enabled biosensors, for instance, can detect multiple biomarkers, improving the sensitivity and accuracy of cancer detection (Patel et al., 2020; Dubey et al., 2022). This not only increases the likelihood of early detection but also supports the monitoring of cancer progression and the effectiveness of treatments, which are vital for optimizing patient outcomes (Caballero et al., 2017).

The implications of this innovation extend beyond individual patient care. By alleviating the significant financial burden associated with traditional cancer diagnostics, microchip technology has the potential to catalyze a systemic transformation. While microchip-based diagnostic platforms are designed to enhance accessibility and affordability, economic barriers persist, particularly in low-resource settings where upfront costs can limit adoption (Tripathi et al., 2014). For healthcare providers operating with constrained budgets, the initial investment required to procure and implement these technologies poses a significant challenge. Mitigating these costs necessitates innovative financial and operational strategies. For instance, public-private partnerships can play a critical role in subsidizing the acquisition of microchip devices, especially in underserved areas. Furthermore, international funding agencies and organizations like the World Health Organization (WHO) could provide grants or low-interest loans to healthcare facilities in resource-limited settings. Coupled with capacity-building initiatives, such as training programs and mobile diagnostic units, these efforts would enable healthcare providers to integrate microchip technologies more effectively. Portable and low-cost

Vol.22, Iss.1, February 2025
URN: urn:nbn:de:hbz:6-60119498897
DOI: 10.17879/60119498365

microchip-based diagnostic platforms can bridge the gap between urban and rural cancer care, promoting a more equitable approach to health across different regions (Haney et al., 2017).

Microchip technology, particularly through the LOC paradigm, encapsulates a future where cancer detection is not only economically viable but also highly efficient (Mishra, 2023; Özyurt et al., 2023). LOC technology minimizes the need for extensive infrastructure by consolidating multiple laboratory processes onto a single microchip. These devices efficiently identify circulating tumor cells (CTCs) or biomarkers related to cancer directly from blood samples, facilitating early detection crucial for improving treatment outcomes and patient survival rates (Ju et al., 2022). Additionally, the integration of microchip technology with nanotechnology has encouraged the development of highly effective nano-enabled biosensors for cancer biomarkers, enhancing the overall potential of LOC technology to provide a comprehensive, yet frugal, solution for cancer diagnostics (Ramesh et al., 2022). Furthermore, these advancements align with global health priorities, addressing disparities in cancer care and supporting the aims of international health initiatives such as the World Health Organization's cancer control strategies (Ngoma, 2006).

Chemical Material Considerations for Lab-on-a-Chip (LOC) Devices

The selection of materials for Lab-on-a-Chip (LOC) devices is paramount, as it directly influences the device's chemical properties, fabrication techniques, and overall performance (Kipling, Haswell and Brown, 2015). Polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS), a silicon-based elastomer, is particularly favored in biomedical LOC applications due to its unique chemical characteristics (Nahak et al., 2022). Its low surface energy contributes to its hydrophobic nature, which is advantageous in microfluidic applications where the prevention of non-specific adsorption is crucial and it also exhibits excellent gas permeability due to its molecular structure, which includes a flexible Si-O backbone that allows for efficient gas diffusion, an essential factor for cell culture applications (Sengupta et al., 2019). Epoxy resins, such as SU-8, offer distinct advantages, including exceptional chemical resistance and thermal stability, attributable to their highly cross-linked polymer network (Abgrall et al., 2007). However, the high cost of these resins can be a limiting factor, especially when considering large-scale production (Ali@Hasim, Ahaitouf and Abdullah, 2021). Silicon is a cornerstone material in microfabrication, revered for its semiconducting properties and chemical inertness (Kumar and Kumbhat, 2016). It shares many properties with glass, such as good thermal stability and solvent resistance, which are vital for maintaining the integrity of the LOC under various chemical conditions but the anisotropic etching process used to create microstructures in silicon results in vertical sidewalls, which are geometrically distinct from the rounded profiles observed in glass structures, influencing fluid dynamics within the chip (Sengupta et al., 2019). Glass is another critical material, especially in applications requiring optical transparency and chemical inertness (Neužil et al., 2014). Furthermore, glass exhibits electroosmotic mobility, which is advantageous for applications involving electrokinetic flow control but the high hardness of glass poses challenges in microfabrication, often necessitating the use of advanced, and costly, micromachining techniques (Hamed et al., 2023). In the emerging field of paper-based microfluidics, materials like cellulose and hydrophobically modified cellulose are gaining traction (Anushka, Bandopadhyay and Das, 2023). While paper-based LOCs are promising due to their low cost and simplicity, challenges remain in improving channel resolution, integrating additional chemical functionalities, and enhancing detection sensitivity (Li, Ballerini and Shen, 2012; Iqbal et al., 2022).

Chemical Applications of Lab-on-a-Chip: Immuno-Biochip in Cancer Treatment

The potential for diagnosing various types of cancer using molecular-based detection methods is significant; however, these methods are often time-consuming, costly, and labor-intensive (Iqbal et al., 2022). To overcome these limitations, biological chips are increasingly being employed for cancer diagnosis, providing rapid, accurate, and cost-effective results (Iqbal et al., 2022). The sensitivity and specificity of these biochips are comparable to traditional molecular and serological assays (Bargahi et al., 2022). A key example is the immuno-biochip, a LOC device designed to detect the epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (EGFR2) protein in breast cancer through antigen-antibody conjugation (Iqbal et al., 2022). The sensitivity of the immuno-biochip can be significantly improved by incorporating nanoparticles (Bargahi et al., 2022). Among various nanomaterials, graphene nanosheets are preferred for their superior electrical and optical conductivity (Radhakrishnan, Mathew and Rout, 2022). The small pores in the graphene foam facilitate effective sample handling during detection in the microfluidic device (Han et al., 2019). Additionally, the immuno-biochip includes an analyzer for visual antigen detection, utilizing electrochemical impedance spectroscopy (EIS) and differential pulse voltammetry (DPV) (Benjamin and Júnior, 2023).

Bridging Treatment Gaps: Microchip Technology and Frugal Innovation in Cancer Care

As healthcare costs continue to escalate and disparities in access to care grow, the concept of frugal innovation becomes increasingly important, particularly within the domain of cancer treatment (Bhatti et al., 2017). The integration of microchip technology with frugal innovation practices offers a transformative pathway from diagnosis to therapy, promising to reshape healthcare landscapes, especially in developing nations. This section explores how microchip technology can bridge the gap between diagnosis and advanced treatment modalities, enhancing access to cancer care in resource-limited settings. Microchips, particularly when integrated with CRISPR-Cas9 technology, offer precise targeted drug delivery and revolutionary gene therapy capabilities, which can significantly improve the efficacy of treatments while reducing costs and side effects (Zhang et al., 2021). This precision in drug delivery exemplifies the core principles of frugal innovation; minimizing resource use while maximizing therapeutic benefits (Ramdorai and Herstatt, 2015; Grover, Garg and Singh, 2024). Additionally, microchip technology facilitates early and accurate cancer detection, crucial for effective treatment planning and improved patient outcomes (Muluneh and Issadore, 2014).

The economic advantages of microchip-facilitated treatments, compared to conventional methods, are substantial. These devices require less infrastructure and generate lower levels of medical waste, contributing to more personalized and cost-effective therapies (Santini et al., 2000). By enabling the customization of treatment plans based on the genetic and molecular profiles of individual tumors, microchips can help clinicians achieve better treatment outcomes while potentially reducing the incidence of adverse side effects (Rahmanian et al., 2023). On a broader scale, the expansion of access to cancer care in developing countries is critical. In developed nations, stringent regulations, while ensuring patient safety and efficacy, may inadvertently slow down the adoption process due to the extensive approval procedures (Sorenson and Drummond, 2014). In developing countries, the regulatory landscape presents additional challenges. The lack of consistent regulatory frameworks across regions may create barriers for global companies seeking to scale microchip technologies (Al Meslamani, 2023). The healthcare gaps in these regions, characterized by limited resources, a shortage of specialized personnel, and high costs, can be significantly mitigated through the adoption of microchip technology and related frugal innovations.

Microchip Technologies & Organoids

Microchip technologies have advanced significantly in the biomedical field, branching out from their conventional electronic applications to encompass sophisticated biological modeling tools such as organoids and organ chips (Huh, Hamilton and Ingber, 2011). Stemming from advancements in stem cell technology and microfabrication, both organoids and organ chips offer unique platforms for studying complex biological processes, though they differ in their designs and functionalities.
Organoids, intricate three-dimensional structures derived from stem cells, closely mimic the cellular organization and function of real tissues, allowing researchers to delve into tissue development, disease progression, and drug response (Lancaster and Knoblich, 2014). However, organoids lack precise control over the microenvironment, limiting their utility in studying critical interactions among different tissue types within an organ. On the other hand, organ chips integrate microfluidic principles to create detailed analogs of human organs on miniature silicon chips (Ingber, 2016). While organoids provide realistic models of tissue architecture, they are less amenable to studying critical interactions necessary for replicating organ functions (Lancaster and Knoblich, 2014). Organ chips, with their intricate microfluidic channels, offer precise control over environmental conditions, enabling more accurate modeling of organ-level functions and disease processes (Ingber, 2016).

Despite their potential, challenges remain in the widespread adoption of organ chips. The validation process for organ chips is complex and lacks standardization, posing barriers

Vol.22, Iss.1, February 2025
URN: urn:nbn:de:hbz:6-60119498897
DOI: 10.17879/60119498365

to smaller entities with limited funding (Moraes et al., 2012). However, recent milestones, such as Sanofi Pasteur's FDA Investigational New Drug (IND) application based on organ chip data, highlight the technology's potential in drug development (Kissner et al., 2021). A multidisciplinary approach involving specialists in stem cell biology, microfabrication, microelectronics, and more is essential for the development of organ chips (Bhatia and Ingber, 2014). While organ chips offer cost savings over traditional animal testing in the long term, their initial costs and complexities hinder widespread adoption, particularly among smaller research groups or startups (Marx, 2016).

Analyzing the data sufficiency and cost components of organoids and organ chips further illuminates their potential impact. Organ chips, despite their higher initial costs, promise more cost-effective solutions compared to conventional animal testing in the long run (Esch, King and Shuler, 2011) leading to frugal innovation. For example, a liver chip sold by C.N. Bio innovations in 2015 was priced at US$22,000 but is argued to be more cost-effective due to reduced reliance on animal testing and associated care costs (Marx, 2016). This projection aligns with estimates suggesting that organ chips could reduce overall drug research and development costs by 10-26 percent (Esch, King and Shuler, 2011). However, accessibility remains a challenge for smaller research groups or startups due to high initial costs associated with organ chip technology (Esch, King and Shuler, 2011). To address this issue, blank microfluidic chips offer a frugal alternative, allowing researchers to customize their experiments by inserting their own cell lines, thereby reducing overhead costs (Meer and Berg, 2012). Despite significant progress, the development of organ chips is still moving slowly, partly due to regulatory challenges and the need for further validation (Ingber, 2022). However, continued investment and regulatory innovation are crucial for overcoming these challenges and fully realizing the potential of organ chips in advancing biomedical research and improving patient care.

Chemistry Aspects of Nanomaterials in Microchip Technology and Their Use in Targeted Drug Delivery for Cancer Treatment

Microchip electrophoresis (ME) operates on the principle of electrophoresis, where a microchip with microchannels is subjected to an electric field and the chemical properties of the materials used in the fabrication and modification of these chips are crucial for optimal ME performance (Bargahi et al., 2022). Gold Nanoparticles (AuNPs) are widely utilized in ME due to their excellent colloidal stability, ease of synthesis, and versatility in chemical modification as they can enhance separation efficiency by interacting with functional groups such as hydroxyl (OH), amino (NH_2), or sulfhydryl (SH) groups (Muluneh and Issadore, 2014). Silica Nanoparticles (SiO_2 NPs) are valued for their high surface area, chemical stability, and ease of modification and they are often used to coat the inner surfaces of microchannels, improving biomolecule separation (Muluneh and Issadore, 2014). Nanomaterials have revolutionized targeted drug delivery systems, particularly in cancer therapy and their unique physical and chemical properties facilitate the precise delivery of therapeutic agents to cancer cells while minimizing damage to healthy tissues (Elumalai, Srinivasan and Shanmugam, 2024).

This section discusses nanomaterials in the context of cancer diagnosis and treatment because of their potential to revolutionize medical practices. Nanomaterials offer unique properties such as small size, large surface area-to-volume ratio, and tunable surface chemistry, making them highly versatile for biomedical applications (Lan et al., 2023). In the field of oncology, nanomaterials have shown promise in improving cancer detection, drug delivery, and therapy monitoring. Firstly, nanomaterials can enhance cancer diagnosis by enabling highly sensitive and specific imaging techniques. Nanoparticles functionalized with targeting ligands can selectively accumulate in tumor tissues, allowing for precise detection using imaging modalities such as magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), computed tomography (CT), or fluorescence imaging (Lan et al., 2023). Additionally, nanomaterial-based contrast agents can enhance the contrast between healthy and diseased tissues, improving the accuracy of diagnostic imaging (Jiang et al., 2023). Secondly, nanomaterials play a crucial role in drug delivery for cancer therapy. Their small size and customizable surface properties enable efficient delivery of therapeutic agents to target sites, minimizing systemic toxicity and enhancing treatment efficacy (Sengupta and Sasisekharan, 2007). By incorporating targeting moieties and therapeutic payloads into nanocarriers, clinicians can tailor treatment regimens to individual patients based on their molecular profiles and disease characteristics (Din et al., 2017). This personalized approach improves treatment outcomes and

Vol.22, Iss.1, February 2025
URN: urn:nbn:de:hbz:6-60119498897
DOI: 10.17879/60119498365

reduces adverse effects by ensuring that therapies are specifically tailored to the patient's unique biology.

Given these potential benefits, discussing nanomaterials in the context of cancer diagnosis and treatment is essential for understanding the current landscape of oncology research and development. Nanotechnology offers innovative solutions to longstanding challenges in cancer care, such as early detection, targeted therapy, and personalized medicine. By exploring the applications and challenges of nanomaterials in oncology, researchers and clinicians can work towards harnessing their full potential to improve patient outcomes and advance cancer treatment strategies. Nanomaterials represent a promising frontier in cancer diagnosis and treatment, offering a multitude of benefits and adaptability. However, alongside their potential advantages come several considerations, including production cost, scalability, safety, and the complexity of nano formulations. As the design and material complexity of nanomedicines increase, so do costs, production requirements, and testing parameters (Lan et al., 2023). Despite the clinical advantages demonstrated by some nanomedicines over conventional formulations, the affordability of production and scalability may hinder their translation into clinical practice.

Moreover, the environmental impact of manufacturing by-products and energy costs, coupled with the complexities of navigating FDA approval, pose additional challenges. Depending on their mode of action, nano formulations may fall under different regulatory classifications by the FDA, further complicating the regulatory landscape (Zhang et al., 2021). However, with rapidly advancing technologies in nanomedicine, there is a pressing need for more consistent and robust guidelines to evaluate clinical trials for nanomaterials (Đorđević et al., 2022).

The cost vs. benefit analysis of nanomedicine poses many questions, even without the issue of unclear regulatory guidelines. Depending on formulation and complexity, nanomedicine can have substantially higher manufacturing costs than conventional medications (Sengupta and Sasisekharan, 2007). Quality of life considerations, often overlooked in clinical trials, are crucial for assessing the value of research and development centered on nanotechnology (Bernhard et al., 1998). Patient quality of life is a critical parameter to evaluate over an extended period because nanomedicine formulations are frequently modified to improve specificity, efficacy, and resistance to medications (Lancaster and Knoblich, 2014; Thapa and Kim, 2023). With cutting-edge technology enhancing therapies and diagnostics, and machine learning applications saving time and money, the future of nanomedicine is undoubtedly bright (Haleem et al., 2022). Preclinical and clinical studies have demonstrated the advantages of nanotechnology in imaging, diagnostics, and cancer treatment (Kemp and Kwon, 2021). However, to fully realize the benefits of early detection in cancer patients, diagnostic screenings must be highly accurate to avoid overtreatment and incorrect diagnoses (Loud and Murphy, 2017). The use of nanotechnology in cancer diagnostics, chemotherapy, and radiation therapy is expected to grow significantly in the near future, providing patients and physicians with highly controllable cancer treatment options (Jin et al., 2020).

Microchip Technologies and Stakeholders Perspectives

In the area of microchip technology applied to oncology, various stakeholders offer unique perspectives that enrich the understanding of its implications and potential. From healthcare providers to patients, policymakers to industry stakeholders, and academic researchers, each group plays a crucial role in shaping the development, adoption, and implementation of microchip technology in cancer care.

From the perspective of healthcare providers, the integration of microchip technology presents both opportunities and challenges. On one hand, it offers the promise of more efficient and accurate cancer detection, which can lead to improved patient outcomes and streamlined workflows. For example, microchip-based diagnostic platforms can reduce the time and resources required for traditional diagnostic procedures, allowing healthcare providers to allocate their time more effectively and potentially reach more patients. However, healthcare providers may also face challenges in adopting and integrating these technologies into their practice, including concerns about training, infrastructure requirements, and workflow disruptions (Borges do Nascimento et al., 2023). Training healthcare professionals to use these advanced technologies requires tailored programs that include both technical and clinical applications (Meyer-Szary et al., 2022). Modular, simulation-based training, and train-the-trainer approaches are essential to scaling knowledge across diverse settings, especially in resource-limited areas (Robinson et al., 2024). Infrastructure

Vol.22, Iss.1, February 2025
URN: urn:nbn:de:hbz:6-60119498897
DOI: 10.17879/60119498365

barriers, particularly in rural settings, demand innovative solutions such as mobile diagnostic units and partnerships with technology providers to deliver affordable, scalable microchip devices (Wang et al., 2016). Cross-disciplinary collaboration, data integration with Electronic Health Records (EHR), and automated tools for administrative tasks can streamline this process (Yeung, 2021). Addressing these challenges will facilitate the widespread adoption of microchip technology, making it a transformative tool in improving cancer care, particularly in underserved regions.
Viewing from the lens of patients, patients stand to benefit significantly from the advancements in microchip technology in oncology. Early cancer detection facilitated by microchip-based diagnostic tools can lead to timely intervention and improved treatment outcomes, potentially saving lives. Additionally, the integration of microchip technology into treatment modalities, such as targeted drug delivery, offers the promise of more personalized and effective therapies with fewer side effects. From the patient perspective, access to these innovations is paramount, highlighting the importance of affordability, accessibility, and patient-centered care (Arora, 2009). Patients may also value the convenience and efficiency of microchip-based diagnostics, particularly if it reduces the need for invasive procedures or lengthy wait times for test results.

For policymakers, the adoption and integration of microchip technology in oncology care represent opportunities to improve healthcare delivery, enhance public health outcomes, and drive economic growth. Policymakers play a crucial role in shaping the regulatory environment, allocating resources, and encouraging collaboration among stakeholders to facilitate the development and implementation of these technologies. Additionally, policymakers must address ethical, legal, and social implications, such as data privacy, equity in access, and reimbursement policies, to ensure that microchip technology benefits society as a whole (Gerke, Minssen and Cohen, 2020). By supporting research and development, investing in infrastructure, and creating incentives for innovation, policymakers can help accelerate the adoption of microchip technology and ensure that it reaches underserved populations.

Academic researchers play a vital role in advancing the understanding of microchip technology in oncology through basic and translational research. Their perspectives encompass a wide range of disciplines, including engineering, biology, medicine, and ethics. Academic researchers contribute to the development of new technologies, evaluate their efficacy and safety, and disseminate knowledge through publications and collaborations. Their perspectives shape the direction of research, influence policy decisions, and drive innovation in the field (Singh et al., 2022). By conducting rigorous studies, exploring novel applications, and engaging in interdisciplinary collaborations, academic researchers contribute to the advancement of microchip technology and its translation into clinical practice.

Microchip Technology and Frugal Innovation

As highlighted in table 1, it is evident that microchip technology in oncology aligns closely with principles that emphasize cost-effectiveness, simplicity, and accessibility, particularly in resource-constrained environments. Microchip technologies, particularly LOC, encapsulate multiple laboratory functions into a single device, significantly reducing the complexity and resource requirements traditionally associated with cancer diagnostics. This integration streamlines the diagnostic process, making it faster and more accessible, particularly in environments where resources are scarce (Nagrath et al., 2007). The cost-effectiveness of these technologies is a key attribute, as they are designed to lower both production and operational costs, thus making cancer care more affordable and accessible, especially in low-resource settings (Patel et al., 2020). Furthermore, the ability of microchip technologies to enable early and accurate detection of cancer enhances the potential for timely and precise treatments, thereby improving survival rates (Shaver, Croom-Perez and Copik, 2021). The portability and accessibility of these devices expand their utility to rural and underserved areas, removing significant barriers to access and democratizing health care (Haney et al., 2017). Advanced integration with technologies such as CRISPR-Cas9 facilitates targeted therapies and personalized treatment plans, highlighting the use of cutting-edge technology to maximize therapeutic benefits while minimizing resource use—a core principle of frugal innovation (Zhang et al., 2021). Additionally, the reduction in infrastructure and personnel needs further lowers barriers to entry for advanced diagnostics and treatments, which is particularly beneficial in regions with limited healthcare infrastructure (Mishra, 2023). Supporting global health initiatives, microchip technology helps in tackling the global cancer burden by aligning with international health goals that aim to make healthcare affordable and accessible globally (Ngoma, 2006). Lastly, the scalability of these technologies

Vol.22, Iss.1, February 2025
URN: urn:nbn:de:hbz:6-60119498897
DOI: 10.17879/60119498365

ensures that they can be produced on a large scale without excessive costs, facilitating their adoption across different healthcare systems and environments (Ramdorai and Herstatt, 2015; Grover, Garg and Singh, 2024).

Discussion & Conclusion

The landscape of microchip technology in oncology represents a journey of exploration and revelation, unveiling both the vast potential and intricate challenges inherent in harnessing this innovative approach to cancer detection and treatment. This study, guided by specific research inquiries, draws upon insights from extant literature and synthesizes perspectives from diverse stakeholders in the domain. At its core, the investigation was anchored by two pivotal research questions: the efficacy of microchips in early cancer detection and their role in facilitating affordable treatment modalities. Through an exhaustive review of the literature spanning microchip technology, oncology, and frugal innovation, the authors endeavored to illuminate these questions.

Addressing the first research question regarding the effectiveness of microchips in early cancer detection, LOC technology emerged as a revolutionary paradigm consolidating multiple laboratory functions onto a single microchip. Resonating throughout the literature is the potential of LOC technology to enhance diagnostic capabilities, offering a faster, more cost-effective, and efficient means of cancer detection. Notably, studies highlight the transformative impact of LOC technology in identifying circulating tumor cells (CTCs) and cancer biomarkers directly from blood samples, thus enabling early interventions crucial for improving treatment outcomes and patient survival rates (Mishra, 2023; Özyurt et al., 2023).

Turning to the second research question concerning the intersection of microchip technology with frugal innovation in facilitating affordable cancer treatment, the researchers encountered a literature marked by promise and complexity. The integration of microchips with CRISPR-Cas9 technology emerged as a beacon of hope, offering precise targeted drug delivery and revolutionary gene therapy capabilities that could significantly improve treatment efficacy while mitigating costs and side effects. Studies provide compelling evidence of the economic advantages and clinical benefits afforded by microchip-facilitated treatments, emphasizing the potential for personalized medicine approaches tailored to individual patient profiles (Moraes et al., 2012; Bhatia and Ingber, 2014). However, scalability and regulatory obstacles may pose challenges to widespread implementation.

In addition to the promise of microchip technology, the study acknowledges the complementary roles played by organoids and nanomaterials in reshaping oncology research and practice. Organoids, intricate three-dimensional structures derived from stem cells, offer realistic models of tissue architecture enabling the study of tissue development, disease progression, and drug response. Studies illuminate the potential of organ chips in providing controlled settings for monitoring cellular responses to various stimuli, thereby facilitating precise analysis critical for preclinical testing and personalized medicine strategies (Lancaster and Knoblich, 2014; Ingber, 2016). However, challenges such as validation processes and cost barriers serve as poignant reminders of the hurdles that must be overcome to fully realize their potential.

The scope for future research is vast and multi-dimensional. Refining the accuracy and reliability of microchip diagnostics, exploring novel applications in cancer treatment, and understanding long-term cost-effectiveness are essential research trajectories. Additionally, addressing scalability and production challenges such as business models, logistical hurdles, and supply chain constraints is critical to ensure these technologies meet global demand without compromising quality. Developing a conducive regulatory and policy environment to facilitate the integration and scaling of microchip technology in healthcare systems globally is another crucial area of inquiry.

Future studies should also delve deeper into the sustainability of microchip technologies, particularly in low-resource settings. Research should explore how these technologies will be maintained, serviced, and disposed of to avoid creating additional burdens in underserved regions. The environmental impact of mass production, particularly electronic waste, and strategies to mitigate such concerns through eco-friendly manufacturing and recycling practices, require thorough investigation.

Engaging in multidisciplinary collaborations among policymakers, healthcare providers, technologists, and patient advocacy groups could significantly accelerate the advancement and adoption of microchip technology. By harnessing frugal innovation, the global healthcare community has the opportunity to democratize access to early cancer detection and effective treatment, especially in low-resource settings. Furthermore, the role of international organizations like the WHO in catalyzing global adoption

Vol.22, Iss.1, February 2025
URN: urn:nbn:de:hbz:6-60119498897
DOI: 10.17879/60119498365

underscores the importance of supporting policies, funding, and innovation-friendly environments to promote equitable and accessible cancer care worldwide.

Table 1: Microchip Technology in Oncology and Frugal Innovation

Aspect of Microchip Technology	Relevance to Frugal Innovation	Impact on Oncology	Reference
Integration of Multiple Lab Functions	Reduces complexity and resource requirements.	Streamlines diagnostics, making cancer detection more accessible and faster.	(Nagrath et al., 2007)
Cost-effectiveness	Lowers production and operational costs.	Makes cancer care more affordable, especially in low-resource settings.	(Patel et al., 2020)
Early and Accurate Detection	Enhances product value by improving outcomes.	Improves survival rates by enabling timely and precise treatments.	(Shaver, Croom-Perez and Copik, 2021)
Portability and Accessibility	Simplifies deployment in diverse environments.	Expands access to diagnostics in rural and underserved areas.	(Haney et al., 2017)
Integration with Advanced Technologies	Leverages cutting-edge technologies for better results.	Enables targeted therapies and personalized treatment plans.	(Zhang et al., 2021)
Reduction in Infrastructure and Personnel Needs	Minimizes the need for extensive medical infrastructure.	Lowers barriers to entry for implementing advanced diagnostics and treatments.	(Mishra, 2023)
Support of Global Health Initiatives	Aligns with international goals for affordable healthcare.	Contributes to reducing the global cancer burden.	(Ngoma, 2006)
Scalability	Adaptable to large scale production without excessive costs.	Facilitates widespread adoption across various healthcare systems.	(Ramdorai and Herstatt, 2015; Grover, Garg and Singh, 2024)

Acknowledgement

The infrastructural support provided by the Center for Research and Innovation in Frugal Technology (CRIFT), FORE School of Management, New Delhi, in completing this paper is gratefully acknowledged. We also extend our sincere gratitude to the reviewers for their constructive feedback and to Ms. Andrea Kanzler, Executive Editor of the Journal of Business Chemistry, for the unwavering support.

Vol.22, Iss.1, February 2025
URN: urn:nbn:de:hbz:6-60119498897
DOI: 10.17879/60119498365

References

Abgrall, P. et al. (2007) 'SU-8 as a structural material for labs-on-chips and microelectromechanical systems', ELECTROPHORESIS, 28(24), pp. 4539–4551. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/elps.200700333.

Al Meslamani, A.Z. (2023) 'Technical and regulatory challenges of digital health implementation in developing countries', Journal of Medical Economics, 26(1), pp. 1057–1060. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/13696998.2023.2249757.

Ali@Hasim, N.R., Ahaitouf, A. and Abdullah, M.Z. (2021) 'Irreversible bonding techniques for the fabrication of a leakage-free printed circuit board-based lab-on-chip in microfluidic platforms—a review', Measurement Science and Technology, 32(5), p. 052001. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6501/abeb92.

Anushka, Bandopadhyay, A. and Das, P.K. (2023) 'Paper based microfluidic devices: a review of fabrication techniques and applications', The European Physical Journal Special Topics, 232(6), pp. 781–815. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1140/epjs/s11734-022-00727-y.

Arora, N.K. (2009) 'Importance of patient-centered care in enhancing patient well-being: a cancer survivor's perspective', Quality of Life Research, 18(1), pp. 1–4. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-008-9415-5.

Bargahi, N. et al. (2022) 'Recent advances for cancer detection and treatment by microfluidic technology, review and update', Biological Procedures Online, 24(1), p. 5. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12575-022-00166-y.

Benjamin, S.R. and Júnior, E.J.M.R. (2023) 'Detection of Cancer Biomarker by Advanced Biosensor', in R. Malviya and S. Sundram (eds) Targeted Cancer Therapy in Biomedical Engineering. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore (Biological and Medical Physics, Biomedical Engineering), pp. 437–464. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-9786-0_12.

Bernhard, J. et al. (1998) 'Missing quality of life data in cancer clinical trials: serious problems and challenges', Statistics in Medicine, 17(5–7), pp. 517–532. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0258(19980315/15)17:5/7<517::AID-SIM799>3.0.CO;2-S.

Bhatia, S.N. and Ingber, D.E. (2014) 'Microfluidic organs-on-chips', Nature Biotechnology, 32(8), pp. 760–772. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1038/nbt.2989.

Bhatti, Y.A. et al. (2017) 'The search for the holy grail: frugal innovation in healthcare from low-income or middle-income countries for reverse innovation to developed countries', BMJ Innovations, 3(4), pp. 212–220. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjinnov-2016-000186.

Borges do Nascimento, I.J. et al. (2023) 'Barriers and facilitators to utilizing digital health technologies by healthcare professionals', NPJ digital medicine, 6(1), p. 161. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-023-00899-4.

Brand, N.R. et al. (2019) 'Delays and Barriers to Cancer Care in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review', The Oncologist, 24(12), pp. e1371–e1380. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1634/theoncologist.2019-0057.

Caballero, D. et al. (2017) 'Organ-on-chip models of cancer metastasis for future personalized medicine: From chip to the patient', Biomaterials, 149, pp. 98–115. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biomaterials.2017.10.005.

Crosby, D. et al. (2022) 'Early detection of cancer', Science, 375(6586), p. eaay9040. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aay9040.

Din, F.U. et al. (2017) 'Effective use of nanocarriers as drug delivery systems for the treatment of selected tumors', International Journal of Nanomedicine, Volume 12, pp. 7291–7309. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2147/IJN.S146315.

Đorđević, S. et al. (2022) 'Current hurdles to the translation of nanomedicines from bench to the clinic', Drug Delivery and Translational Research, 12(3), pp. 500–525. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s13346-021-01024-2.

Dubey, A.K. et al. (2022) 'Exploring nano-enabled CRISPR-Cas-powered strategies for efficient diagnostics and treatment of infectious diseases', Journal of Nanostructure in Chemistry, 12(5), pp. 833–864. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40097-022-00472-7.

Vol.22, Iss.1, February 2025
URN: urn:nbn:de:hbz:6-60119498897
DOI: 10.17879/60119498365

Elumalai, K., Srinivasan, S. and Shanmugam, A. (2024) ‘Review of the efficacy of nanoparticle-based drug delivery systems for cancer treatment’, Biomedical Technology, 5, pp. 109–122. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bmt.2023.09.001.

Esch, M.B., King, T.L. and Shuler, M.L. (2011) ‘The Role of Body-on-a-Chip Devices in Drug and Toxicity Studies’, Annual Review of Biomedical Engineering, 13(1), pp. 55–72. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-bioeng-071910-124629.

Francies, F.Z. et al. (2020) ‘Breast cancer in low-middle income countries: abnormality in splicing and lack of targeted treatment options’, American Journal of Cancer Research, 10(5), pp. 1568–1591.

Gerke, S., Minssen, T. and Cohen, G. (2020) ‘Ethical and legal challenges of artificial intelligence-driven healthcare’, in Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare. Elsevier, pp. 295–336. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-818438-7.00012-5.

Grover, U., Garg, J. and Singh, A. (2024) ‘From brass to brilliance: Frugal innovation for safer public spaces’, Journal of Business Chemistry, 21(2), pp. 53–62. Available at: https://doi.org/10.17879/96948485766.

Haleem, A. et al. (2022) ‘Medical 4.0 technologies for healthcare: Features, capabilities, and applications’, Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems, 2, pp. 12–30. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iotcps.2022.04.001.

Hamed, H. et al. (2023) ‘Applications, materials, and fabrication of micro glass parts and devices: An overview’, Materials Today, 66, pp. 194–220. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mattod.2023.03.005.

Han, X. et al. (2019) ‘Applications of nanoparticles in biomedical imaging’, Nanoscale, 11(3), pp. 799–819. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1039/c8nr07769j.

Haney, K. et al. (2017) ‘The Role of Affordable, Point-of-Care Technologies for Cancer Care in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Review and Commentary’, IEEE Journal of Translational Engineering in Health and Medicine, 5, pp. 1–14. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1109/JTEHM.2017.2761764.

Huh, D., Hamilton, G.A. and Ingber, D.E. (2011) ‘From 3D cell culture to organs-on-chips’, Trends in Cell Biology, 21(12), pp. 745–754. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tcb.2011.09.005.

Ingber, D.E. (2016) ‘Reverse Engineering Human Pathophysiology with Organs-on-Chips’, Cell, 164(6), pp. 1105–1109. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2016.02.049.

Ingber, D.E. (2022) ‘Human organs-on-chips for disease modelling, drug development and personalized medicine’, Nature Reviews Genetics, 23(8), pp. 467–491. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1038/s41576-022-00466-9.

Iqbal, M.J. et al. (2022) ‘Biosensing chips for cancer diagnosis and treatment: a new wave towards clinical innovation’, Cancer Cell International, 22(1), p. 354. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12935-022-02777-7.

Jiang, Z. et al. (2023) ‘Nanomaterial-based CT contrast agents and their applications in image-guided therapy’, Theranostics, 13(2), pp. 483–509. Available at: https://doi.org/10.7150/thno.79625.

Jin, C. et al. (2020) ‘Application of Nanotechnology in Cancer Diagnosis and Therapy - A Mini-Review’, International Journal of Medical Sciences, 17(18), pp. 2964–2973. Available at: https://doi.org/10.7150/ijms.49801.

Ju, S. et al. (2022) ‘Detection of circulating tumor cells: opportunities and challenges’, Biomarker Research, 10(1), p. 58. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40364-022-00403-2.

Kemp, J.A. and Kwon, Y.J. (2021) ‘Cancer nanotechnology: current status and perspectives’, Nano Convergence, 8(1), p. 34. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1186/s40580-021-00282-7.

Kipling, G.D., Haswell, S.J. and Brown, N.J. (2015) ‘A Considered Approach to Lab-on-a-Chip Fabrication’, in J. Castillo-León and W.E. Svendsen (eds) Lab-on-a-Chip Devices and Micro-Total Analysis Systems. Cham: Springer International Publishing, pp. 53–82. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-08687-3_4.

Kissner, T. et al. (2021) ‘Challenges of non-clinical safety testing for biologics: A Report of the 9th BioSafe European Annual General Membership Meeting’, mAbs, 13(1), p. 1938796. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/19420862.2

ISSN 1613-9623

021.1938796.

Kumar, N. and Kumbhat, S. (2016) Essentials in Nanoscience and Nanotechnology. 1st edn. Wiley. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119096122.

Lan, H. et al. (2023) 'The role of nanoparticles and nanomaterials in cancer diagnosis and treatment: a comprehensive review', American Journal of Cancer Research, 13(12), pp. 5751–5784.

Lancaster, M.A. and Knoblich, J.A. (2014) 'Organogenesis in a dish: Modeling development and disease using organoid technologies', Science, 345(6194), p. 1247125. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1247125.

Li, X., Ballerini, D.R. and Shen, W. (2012) 'A perspective on paper-based microfluidics: Current status and future trends', Biomicrofluidics, 6(1), p. 011301. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1063/1.3687398.

Loud, J.T. and Murphy, J. (2017) 'Cancer Screening and Early Detection in the 21 st Century', Seminars in Oncology Nursing, 33(2), pp. 121–128. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soncn.2017.02.002.

Marx, U. (2016) 'Biology-inspired microphysiological system approaches to solve the prediction dilemma of substance testing', ALTEX [Preprint]. Available at: https://doi.org/10.14573/altex.1603161.

Meer, A.D.V.D. and Berg, A.V.D. (2012) 'Organs-on-chips: breaking the in vitro impasse', Integrative Biology, 4(5), p. 461. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1039/c2ib00176d.

Meyer-Szary, J. et al. (2022) 'The Role of 3D Printing in Planning Complex Medical Procedures and Training of Medical Professionals—Cross-Sectional Multispecialty Review', International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19(6), p. 3331. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19063331.

Mishra, N. (2023) 'Lab-On-A-Chip Technology in Health Care', in K. Guha et al. (eds) MEMS and Microfluidics in Healthcare. Singapore: Springer Nature Singapore (Lecture Notes in Electrical Engineering), pp. 11–23. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-8714-4_2.

Mollica, M.A. et al. (2020) 'Follow-Up Care for Breast and Colorectal Cancer Across the Globe: Survey Findings From 27 Countries', JCO Global Oncology, (6), pp. 1394–1411. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1200/GO.20.00180.

Moraes, C. et al. (2012) 'Organs-on-a-Chip: A Focus on Compartmentalized Microdevices', Annals of Biomedical Engineering, 40(6), pp. 1211–1227. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10439-011-0455-6.

Muluneh, M. and Issadore, D. (2014) 'Microchip-based detection of magnetically labeled cancer biomarkers', Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 66, pp. 101–109. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addr.2013.09.013.

Nagrath, S. et al. (2007) 'Isolation of rare circulating tumour cells in cancer patients by microchip technology', Nature, 450(7173), pp. 1235–1239. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1038/nature06385.

Nahak, B.K. et al. (2022) 'Advances in Organ-on-a-Chip Materials and Devices', ACS Applied Bio Materials, 5(8), pp. 3576–3607. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1021/acsabm.2c00041.

Nass, S.J. et al. (2019) 'Improving Cancer Diagnosis and Care: Patient Access to High-Quality Oncologic Pathology', The Oncologist, 24(10), pp. 1287–1290. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1634/theoncologist.2019-0261.

Neužil, P. et al. (2014) 'From chip-in-a-lab to lab-on-a-chip: towards a single handheld electronic system for multiple application-specific lab-on-a-chip (ASLOC)', Lab Chip, 14(13), pp. 2168–2176. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1039/C4LC00310A.

Ngoma, T. (2006) 'World Health Organization cancer priorities in developing countries', Annals of Oncology, 17, pp. viii9–viii14. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/annonc/mdl982.
Özyurt, C. et al. (2023) 'Lab-on-a-chip systems for cancer biomarker diagnosis', Journal of Pharmaceutical and Biomedical Analysis, 226, p. 115266. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpba.2023.115266.

Patel, M.I. et al. (2020) 'Cancer Disparities and Health Equity: A Policy Statement From the American Society of Clinical Oncology', Journal of Clinical Oncology, 38(29), pp. 3439–3448. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1200/JCO.20.00642.

Vol.22, Iss.1, February 2025
URN: urn:nbn:de:hbz:6-60119498897
DOI: 10.17879/60119498365

Radhakrishnan, S., Mathew, M. and Rout, C.S. (2022) 'Microfluidic sensors based on two-dimensional materials for chemical and biological assessments', Materials Advances, 3(4), pp. 1874–1904. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1039/D1MA00929J.

Rahmanian, M. et al. (2023) 'A micropillar array-based microfluidic chip for label-free separation of circulating tumor cells: The best micropillar geometry?', Journal of Advanced Research, 47, pp. 105–121. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jare.2022.08.005.

Ramdorai, A. and Herstatt, C. (2015) Frugal Innovation in Healthcare: How Targeting Low-Income Markets Leads to Disruptive Innovation. Cham: Springer International Publishing (India Studies in Business and Economics). Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16336-9.

Ramesh, M. et al. (2022) 'Nanotechnology-Enabled Biosensors: A Review of Fundamentals, Design Principles, Materials, and Applications', Biosensors, 13(1), p. 40. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/bios13010040.

Robinson, S.J.A. et al. (2024) 'Simulation-Based Education of Health Workers in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review', Global Health: Science and Practice, 12(6), p. e2400187. Available at: https://doi.org/10.9745/GHSP-D-24-00187.

Santini, J.T. et al. (2000) 'Microchip technology in drug delivery', Annals of Medicine, 32(6), pp. 377–379. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3109/07853890008995941.

Schootman, M. et al. (2015) 'The utility of Google Trends data to examine interest in cancer screening', BMJ Open, 5(6), pp. e006678–e006678. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2014-006678.

Sengupta, P. et al. (2019) 'Lab-on-a-chip sensing devices for biomedical applications', in Bioelectronics and Medical Devices. Elsevier, pp. 47–95. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102420-1.00004-2.

Sengupta, S. and Sasisekharan, R. (2007) 'Exploiting nanotechnology to target cancer', British Journal of Cancer, 96(9), pp. 1315–1319. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.bjc.6603707.

Shaver, K.A., Croom-Perez, T.J. and Copik, A.J. (2021) 'Natural Killer Cells: The Linchpin for Successful Cancer Immunotherapy', Frontiers in Immunology, 12, p. 679117. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2021.679117.

Singh, D. et al. (2022) 'Journey of organ on a chip technology and its role in future healthcare scenario', Applied Surface Science Advances, 9, p. 100246. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsadv.2022.100246.

Sorenson, C. and Drummond, M. (2014) 'Improving Medical Device Regulation: The United States and Europe in Perspective', The Milbank Quarterly, 92(1), pp. 114–150. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0009.12043.

Thapa, R.K. and Kim, J.O. (2023) 'Nanomedicine-based commercial formulations: current developments and future prospects', Journal of Pharmaceutical Investigation, 53(1), pp. 19–33. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s40005-022-00607-6.

Tripathi, N. et al. (2014) 'Barriers for early detection of cancer amongst Indian rural women', South Asian Journal of Cancer, 03(02), pp. 122–127. Available at: https://doi.org/10.4103/2278-330X.130449.

Wang, S. et al. (2016) 'Advances in addressing technical challenges of point-of-care diagnostics in resource-limited settings', Expert Review of Molecular Diagnostics, 16(4), pp. 449–459. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1586/14737159.2016.1142877.

Weir, H.K. et al. (2021) 'Cancer Incidence Projections in the United States Between 2015 and 2050', Preventing Chronic Disease, 18, p. 210006. Available at: https://doi.org/10.5888/pcd18.210006.

Winton, C.E. et al. (2016) 'A microchip platform for structural oncology applications', npj Breast Cancer, 2(1), p. 16016. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1038/npjbcancer.2016.16.

Yeung, K. (2021) 'The Health Care Sector's Experience of Blockchain: A Cross-disciplinary Investigation of Its Real Transformative Potential', Journal of Medical Internet Research, 23(12), p. e24109. Available at: https://doi.org/10.2196/24109.

Zhang, H. et al. (2021) 'Application of the CRISPR/Cas9-based gene editing technique in basic research, diagnosis,

Vol.22, Iss.1, February 2025
URN: urn:nbn:de:hbz:6-60119498897
DOI: 10.17879/60119498365

and therapy of cancer', Molecular Cancer, 20(1), p. 126. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1186/s12943-021-01431-6.